

---

Subject: Re: Gun control

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Fri, 27 Jun 2008 19:59:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I see it like this... the government has every right to restrict civil liberties ONLY IF the consent of the people it governs is involved.

For example, if I was to propose the licensing of heavy weapons to the government and you were to propose that it was a bad idea to do that, the government could chose to go either way regardless of what the Constitution says because the idea was proposed by an individual that is under the government's 'rule.'

However, if the government one day said that they are putting a restriction on heavy weapons with no prior warning, than THAT is unconstitutional because the people's say was not involved. It would also be unconstitutional if they instated such a law regardless if the majority of the people voted against it.

So in order for it to be proposed and looked at without it being unconstitutional is if it is proposed by the people. And in order for it to fall through and be instated it needs to be approved by the people. The government is just there to mediate the people's wants.

The Constitution is not a rule book, it is merely a guide line. Things said in the Constitution should never be taken with the fullest seriousness because things in the Constitution can be changed by the will of the people. That is why basing an argument on something that is said in the Constitution is quite pointless (as it can be changed with a simple proposal and vote).

---